

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/195,604

Applicant(s)

TOMIDOKORO ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph R. Pokrzywa

Art Unit

2622

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joseph R. Pokrzywa.

(3) _____.

(2) Kurt Berger.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 July 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ogura and Ote et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Joseph R. Pokrzywa 7/20/05
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the current claim language and the current art rejection, and ways that may overcome the current rejection. The examiner agrees that an amendment that changes the term "image forming device" to a "printer" or a "copier" would overcome the secondary reference of Ote, therein overcoming the current art rejection. The examiner further suggests amending the limitation that states "a process periodically initiated" to read "said detection periodically initiated", so as to clarify that the actual detection is the "process" periodically initiated and performed within the copier or printer..